



**Asia-Pacific
Economic Cooperation**

2019/SOM1/EC/WKSP2/002

**The Digital Economy: Measurement, Regulation and
Inclusion – Self-Funded Economic Committee
Workshop: Background Paper**

Submitted by: Australia



**Workshop on the Digital Economy:
Measurement, Regulation and Inclusion
Santiago, Chile
6 March 2019**



Digital Economy: Measurement, Regulation And Inclusion

Self-Funded Economic Committee Workshop

Background Paper

6 March, 2019

Contents

1. Context	3
Introduction	3
Transition to Digital Economy	3
2. Session One: Measurement of the Digital Economy	6
Key Issues	6
Session Objectives.....	8
3. Session Two: Regulation in the Digital Economy	9
Key Issues	9
Session Objectives.....	11
4. Session Three: Inclusive Growth in Digital Economy	12
Key Issues	13
Session Objectives.....	15

Acknowledgements

This paper has been prepared by Peter Lovelock and the Australian APEC Study Centre with financial support from the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade

1. Context

Introduction

The emergence of digital technology has transformed how people connect, learn, do business, buy goods, access services, work, and more. But as business and consumers move online and technology continues to evolve apace, governments are grappling with a complex challenge: how to harness new opportunities to drive economic growth, whilst ensuring that rules and standards are in place to protect consumers and business, and that the benefits of digitalisation are shared across the community?

The pace of change, and the scale of opportunity connected to the digital economy, are nowhere more evident than in the Asia Pacific. Our region is one of the fastest growing in the world – both economically, and in terms of connectivity. By 2017, Asia had the largest number of Internet users in the world, with 1.8 billion people online. The number of Internet users grew at a compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of 11.52% between 2009 and 2015. More than half of Southeast Asia's population now uses the Internet – 339.2 million active Internet users (53% of the population) – and this number has grown by more than 30% since 2016. Data consumption is also growing exponentially, with Asian Internet traffic expected to grow at a CAGR of 22% from 361.7 exabytes in 2016 to 814.2 exabytes per year by 2020.

Importantly for such a populous and dynamic region, the digital economy offers tremendous potential for inclusion, including of groups that traditionally face social and economic marginalisation. Once connected, rural communities, MSMEs and women can far more easily connect to market opportunity and participate in value chains, including global value chains, and create innovative products or distribution networks using digital tools. However, enabling this potential of the digital economy requires bridging the digital divide - which means affordable access to digital infrastructure and access to tools, knowledge and skills, and the necessary governance (consumer protection, etc). For any of this to be universally achievable requires the development of appropriate measurement tools to identify opportunity and demand for access, and to capture progress when it is made in these areas.

In 2017, APEC Ministers welcomed the development of the APEC Internet and Digital Economy Roadmap. The Economic Committee (EC) responded by creating an Informal Roadmap Group (IRG), which was charged with identifying the gaps in the EC's coverage of digital economy issues, and determining priorities based on a survey of members. The IRG's work identified three of the Roadmap's Focus Areas as priorities for the EC, relating to: holistic policy frameworks; coherent regulatory approaches; and inclusiveness. At EC2 in August 2018, the plenary discussion identified a further, crosscutting Roadmap priority: improving baseline measurement of the digital economy.

This paper, and the associated workshop 'The Digital Economy: Measurement, Regulation and Inclusion', aim to support the EC's work on its digital economy priorities, and advance the implementation of the AIDER.

Transition to Digital Economy

There is no universally accepted definition of the digital economy, but a common, albeit somewhat narrow, understanding is the share of GDP accounted for by the ICT sector. The

approach adopted in this workshop will be a much broader concept, defining the digital economy as the entirety of sectors that operate using Internet-enabled communications and networks irrespective of industry.

Digital platforms have changed the economics of doing business across borders, bringing down the cost of international interactions and transactions. They create markets and user communities on a global scale, providing businesses with a huge base of potential customers and effective ways to reach them. The ability of small businesses to reach new markets supports economic growth everywhere; as demonstrated by increases in GDP and employment. Further, individuals participate in globalisation directly by using digital platforms to access information, to learn, find work, showcase their talent, and build social networks. They gain social benefits from e-government services, are financially included, make purchases online, benefit from online education, or are assisted by remote medical facilities.

This trend will continue to grow as the processing and analysis of ever-larger amounts of data become possible with increasingly sophisticated technology. For this reason, cross-border data flows are fundamental to the development of innovative technologies such as AI and IoT, which are underpinned by the free flow of data. These developments, which take advantage of technologies such as cloud infrastructure and cloud services' processing capabilities, provide insight to businesses, as the use of data analytics – across industries – streamlines business practices, leading to cost savings, increased efficiency, and new innovations.

In addition to the cross-jurisdictional issues, and of particular note, is the cross-sectoral impact that the free flow of data is having on industries and businesses across all sectors, including: finance; transport; logistics and delivery; retail; insurance; healthcare; education; agriculture and aquaculture; manufacturing; energy; tourism and so on. This is commonly termed 'digital disruption'.

There are various ways in which digital disruption occurs:

- *Product or service substitution*, such as the displacement of music cassettes and compact disks with streamed music online, or more starkly, the displacement of printed motorway maps by GPS systems in smartphones which are now widely used to navigate drivers;
- *By-pass*, whereby for example, payment no longer goes through the existing gatekeeper thereby eliminating demand for its services, as in the case of P2P funds transfer offered by TransferWise, which by-passes banks or online insurance sales platforms, which eliminate the need for an agent network; and
- *Technological paradigm shift*, such as cloud computing, which represents a fundamental change in how consumers procure, access and use IT infrastructure while offering lower costs and rapid scalability.

Digital disruption also poses a challenge to regulators who now need to update their concepts, definitions and approaches in light of shifting business models. The merging of cross-economy and cross-sectoral modes of operation call for a careful re-assessment of regulatory policy to ensure that innovation is not being held back unnecessarily while also ensuring that consumer safety, privacy and other regulatory goals are met.

While it is increasingly recognized that the free flow of data stands to have a transformational impact on both the economic growth and social development, attempts to quantify it have to

date struggled with the lack of well-established measurement criteria and reliable data. An oft-cited 2011 study by the McKinsey Global Institute estimated that the Internet accounts for 3.4% of overall GDP in the 13 economies studied. In 2014, the OECD measured the digital economy, defined more widely as the ICT sector, as accounting 'for 6% of total value added, 4% of employment and 12% of total fixed investment in the OECD area'.

These studies provide useful starting points, but have proven less useful as policy or regulatory guides. Studies focused on measuring the impact at a sectoral level (e.g. e-commerce) or on non-financial metrics (e.g. the rate of financial inclusion) offer more straightforward assessments, but are limited in their broader application, and are impossible to use on a comparative basis in the absence of a methodology for consistent and extendable digital data collection. This is important because the choices required and the opportunity cost involved in assigning resources to the development of the digital economy are already becoming significant. Without demonstrable impact and measurement, the resource diversion required to drive digital economy and digital trade development will be hard to justify and maintain.

2. Session One: Measurement of the Digital Economy

Data is the currency of the digital economy. For policy makers to be able to plan and implement successfully, there needs to be both a framework and a process for the collection, accounting, and analysis of statistics and data. Just as the digital economy requires interoperability, policy benchmarks require statistics and data to be comparable across platforms, sectors and economies.

While basic telecoms access data such as mobile penetration and broadband subscription indicators have become relatively common, a number of APEC economies still show missing data across basic statistical categories. But to enable effective policy making across the emerging digital economy, the data not only needs to exist and be accessible; it needs to be consistent, regularly updated, and consistent across sectors and jurisdictions.

Key Issues

There are numerous challenges to measuring the economic value and impact of cross-border data flows, including:

- Limited scope of data;
- Lack of standard nomenclature; and
- Nature of cross-border data flows.

1. Limited scope of data

There is a lack of indicators for measuring the digital economy and a lack of the accompanying frameworks necessary for supporting regional digital trade. Some existing work is underway in this space by international organisations. The OECD is developing work on measuring GDP in the digital economy through the formation of a satellite account. On digital trade, which is one aspect of the digital economy, the IMF and OECD have conducted a stocktaking exercise and are developing a conceptual and measurement framework. UPU, UNCTAD, WTO and OECD have also convened a Working Group on measuring e-commerce in the digital economy. However, it is still relatively early days in this process. In many of the emerging APEC economies, measurement data for even the most basic indicators is often missing or inconsistent. This is a gap of fundamental importance to promoting regional digital economy development, and is one that can only be addressed by regional or international organisations.

In recent years, a number of studies have reported on the size and importance of the digital economy and, to a lesser extent, on digital trade. Because of the limitations in the data, each of these are of necessity still piecemeal and, in almost all cases, rough estimates based on selected extrapolations. Indeed, in most cases, the economic impact of digital is usually an estimate based upon what are assumed to be reasonable proxies. Often, measurements of e-commerce have been used, particularly in trade publications, to indicate the potential for the digital economy and digital trade, and the value of cross-border data flows. However, e-commerce itself does not have a consistent definition nor a consistent set of measurements across economies, and such estimates therefore vary widely.

- What are the baseline measurements (indicators) that should be employed? What gaps exist?
- How valid are existing proxies, such as e-commerce for estimating the size and potential of the digital economy and of digital trade?

- How to improve the overall coverage and quality of the government statistics on the service-sector?

2. Lack of standard nomenclature and methodology

Attempts to quantify the impact of the digital economy and data flows have been problematic due to the lack of well-established measurement criteria, and the lack of either widely accepted methodology for assigning an economic value to the Internet, or generally agreed standards on metrics for measuring or classifying traffic. Studies that focus on measuring the impact on a sectoral level (e.g. e-commerce) or on non-financial metrics, offer more straightforward assessments but are also hard to evaluate, as a comparative analysis is impossible in the absence of widely accepted terms and methodology.

The approaches to measurement are also limited by the lack of widely agreed-upon standard terminology and definitions. This includes definitions of the various types of data flows or of what comprises the broader digital economy. For example, while there is a distinction between the Internet economy and the digital economy the terms are often used interchangeably.

- **Internet economy:** represents a stand-alone sector, and refers to the economic activities, inputs, outputs and employment directly associated with the use of the Internet.
- **Digital economy:** refers to a connected economy, and relies on enhanced interconnectivity of networks, and the interoperability of digital platforms in all sectors of the economy and society to offer convergent services. For example, digital traffic that crosses between telecommunications and banking networks.

At the domestic level, economies' statistical agencies need to collect more granular data. Estimates of the value of data flows and the digital economy are often limited to "tech-related" sectors of the economy. However, due to the cross-cutting nature of the digital economy, the impacts of data flows reach well beyond the tech-sector.

- How large is cross-border e-commerce in comparison with domestic e-commerce?
- How to develop standard nomenclature or standard definitions for concepts related to data flows, distinguishing between concepts such as digital economy, digitally-intensive, digitally enabled economy, and ICT?
- How do we effectively calculate an economy's domestic accounts to take account of the sharing and gig economies, among other new disruptions?

3. Nature of Cross-Border Data Flows

It is difficult to quantify the role of data in trade, as many cross-border data transfers do not involve money changing hands as information moves from one economy to another. Movement of data from Economy A to Economy B is usually accomplished by copying the data, rather than by the physical transfer of a good (i.e. exporting from Economy A and importing by Economy B). This makes cross-border data flows hard to count in traditional trade statistics based on imports and exports. Even in situations where statistics may implicitly capture the economic value generated by cross-border data transactions, it is difficult to attribute gains in productivity or GDP to these flows.

There is also limited evidence on how businesses utilise data flows, including how data flows contribute to a firm's costs, profits, or productivity.

- How to develop a greater understanding of how firms use data flows and what economic value the data flows provide?
- How to develop improved and consistent macro-economic statistics to measure the value of cross-border data flows, such as the contribution of cross-border data flows to GDP?
- How to effectively facilitate data sharing and the linking of public and private datasets, where legally and logistically feasible and consistent with strong privacy protections for firms?

Session Objectives

Measurements are needed to support policy and decision making in planning and developing digital services access and delivery, and in this there is a huge gap in understanding what to look at and how to measure. Policymakers and statisticians urgently need to come together to define a better evidence base upon which increased public awareness can be built, and more fully informed decisions can be made so as to effectively (i) prioritise and allocate resources at the domestic level, and (ii) coordinate frameworks at the regional level.

3. Session Two: Regulation in the Digital Economy

From a policy maker and regulator's point of view, the emergence of the digital economy changes the landscape. As industries, markets, and pricing strategies are transformed, the traditional industry-specific approach to policy setting will increasingly fail to enable expected economic growth and social development outcomes. How to advance financial inclusion without focusing on connectivity, social media, identity profiling? How to successfully advance effective universal education without consulting data analytics, behaviour profiling, content delivery, and collaborative communication? Even more challenging is the job confronting the regulator, with the traditional risk management-oriented approach failing to deliver expected regulatory control or provide adequate consumer protection. Is Uber a taxi company or a software company? Is Alipay a bank or non-bank financial institution, or is it a technology (or e-commerce) company?

Moreover, what is a 'monopoly' and what is adequate market competition in such cross sectoral growth? Previously-dominant regulated companies have lost ground to a new wave of 'next generation' companies. Market definitions that were vital to regulators when identifying 'significant market power' are increasingly failing to work effectively. As an editorial in the London Financial Times aptly put it, "Competition regulators need to arm themselves with new concepts. On mergers, rather than concentration in particular markets, the focus should shift to the potential for customer lock-in". The editorial raised two further important points: "Ensuring the interoperability of technology will be key.... and the need for regulators to take account of the role of dynamic pricing algorithms which effectively "eliminate the very notion of market prices, and with it the consumer surplus".

This brings us back to the central theme of the workshop: what to measure for effective regulation in the cross-cutting digital environment, and how to measure effectively and consistently.

Key Issues

1. Markets and Business Models

The regulation of digital services and service providers is challenging from several points of view: (i) on what ground (and within which sector) the regulation is justified, (ii) whether regulations deter new entrants and choke off innovation, and (iii) whether regulation is practical and enforceable given (a) the speed with which new technologies and business models evolve, and (b) digital services cut cross both different sectors and many different jurisdictions. A key consideration of regulators is to determine the nature of the markets in which digital service providers operate, and to understand how their business models work in those markets and how they differ from those of traditional service providers. For example:

- To what extent is there a danger that regulation of over-the-top (OTT) services will slow down the response times of traditional services providers to the changing environment?
- How best to understand and frame the use of data, and 'big data'? What data, for example, should be considered public, what should be considered private, and what should be considered proprietary? How does this impact the use and development of 'big data' and data analytics?

- Do tax policies need to be reconsidered or is it too early, and risk having a negative impact on the growth of the domestic economy?
- How should e-commerce sites be viewed as against traditional retailers? Are the business models substantively different or substantively similar?
- How should cross-border delivery of goods and services be viewed? In terms of business model, opportunity, tariffs, competition, registration and taxation?
- How can regulatory indices measuring services and digital restrictions, help regulators identify bottlenecks?

2. Investment

Investment into local markets and the local use of digital technologies encourages competition. Any unnecessary constraints on such investments threaten to undermine potential competition, innovation and opportunity.

- Are there unnecessary restrictions on access to funding in the digital economy?
- How to promote investment both from domestic and international sources without unfairly tilting the playing field? How to assess? What approaches have been shown to work?
- What is the impact of acquisitions or mergers of investment in digital services?

3. Competition and Consumer Protection

There is little doubt that genuine competition is a driver of innovation and customer service. Regulators and policy-makers can protect and accelerate competition in a number of ways. But this requires clarity on the markets for which competition is being supported.

- What is anti-competitive behaviour in a digital landscape?
- What is the role of the competition authority in assessing digital services? To encourage innovation, to control prices, to promote local services? And how to work with other agencies to make such assessments?
- How to understand and measure consumer welfare in a digital environment, and to what extent should this be the basis for competition and anti-trust measures?
- How to provide recourse for consumers (consumer protection) in an interconnected digital environment?

4. Data Protection and Security

Comprehensive data protection, providing clear and consistent rules, is increasingly being seen to be a pre-condition for successful management of the digital economy and digital trade. However, deploying such regulatory regimes that can (a) manage data consistently across sectors of the economy, and (b) work with other jurisdictions, is proving to be challenging, and increasingly brings to the fore the need for supplementary frameworks.

- How should we assess data protection frameworks?
- How best to measure and ensure data security?
- How should we measure restrictions on data transfers (cross-sectoral and cross-border) and restrictions on the collection of data? How is this being done most effectively? What are the impacts of such restrictions?

Session Objectives

For policymakers, the changing digital landscape is reordering the requirements for establishing the rules of road domestically and international trade order. To respond effectively requires effective tools of assessment, and subsequently, enforcement.

- How to approach regulation of digital activity and ensure coherent regulatory frameworks – both cross-sectoral and cross-jurisdictional?
- What information is required to develop regulatory indicators? Which indicators exist, and where are the gaps?
- Which regulatory indicators should APEC/EC prioritise?
- How are international and regional initiatives and approaches to digital regulation linking up? What role for APEC/EC?
- What are the key issues and priorities for the EC in regulation of digital economy, and where should future work initiatives focus specifically?

4. Session Three: Inclusive Growth in Digital Economy

The digital economy offers tremendous potential to help economies achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Digital products and services can dramatically reduce costs and improve access for millions of people, whether it is healthcare, education, financing or information. In the digital world, governments can now deliver public services in a more targeted way, at minimal cost, and with increased agility and impact. Once the digital infrastructure is in place, new services can be added at much lower cost. Governments and firms can also experiment and innovate relying on the aggregate demand and direct feedback of citizens in an environment where location is immaterial, and the cost and methods of communication have been drastically altered.

Digital tools such as IoT, big data and AI, also offer enhanced capacity to track achievement of the SDGs. The SDGs comprise 17 Goals subdivided into 169 targets and 232 indicators. They are more complex and cover a much broader range of issues compared to the MDGs, thereby creating a challenge for statistical agencies. Big data that is generated as a by-product of people's interactions in the digital economy can serve as an important resource, providing insights on human behaviour which can be used to enhance their quality of life. This increased ability to deliver innovative social services, represents an opportunity for policy makers to create public good, at the same time it requires improved agility and responsiveness from public administrations, particularly in the face of changing citizen expectations.

Constraints remain, however, on regulations that can curtail the flow of digital goods and services, especially across borders. For smaller or emerging economies these constraints result in less interest from foreign participants – often the leaders in the sector – and a far slower transfer of expertise and skills, as well as a dampening of potential demand for the ancillary goods and services that are part of the ecosystem of innovative sectors and developer communities.

Inclusive growth in the digital economy is also constrained by social and cultural barriers to participation.¹ These include gender bias, poverty, disability, ethnicity and other differences. As the shift towards a digital society continues apace, exclusion on social and cultural grounds will impede economic growth that is diverse, stable and sustainable. Those segments of the population without the education and skills to operate in the digital realm face further marginalisation if they cannot access online services, or seek employment in digital labour markets. It is concerning that women and girls in emerging economies are 26% less likely to have a smart phone to access mobile Internet (this divide is widening); or that women and

¹ Note: it is important to differentiate structural reforms and structural exclusion or discrimination. Structural reforms are laws and policies that make markets work better (see following text). Structural exclusion is due to (often invisible) social and cultural norms and deeply held attitudes, even apart from laws or the working of markets. It might be *legal* for a young woman to enrol in an engineering program and become a software engineer. However, that young woman might face social pressure from her spouse, family or the wider society to consider other career options or to stay at home. Furthermore, several firms might fail to take her job application seriously due to assumptions about whether women can do such kind of work. In a normal situation this woman might improve her earnings by upgrading her skills, but in the face of structural barriers attitudes might have to change for her to access economic opportunities. The situation becomes even more complicated because many groups are economically disadvantaged and at the same time face structural barriers. Thus, the English language and APEC terminology are confusing: *structural reforms* can increase economic opportunity but they do not always address *structural patterns of discrimination*.

girls in all economies are far less likely than their male counterparts to pursue careers in ICT and STEM – which in turn limits their ability to gain employment in professions that offer relatively higher wages. Policy makers must therefore recognise and address social barriers that inhibit inclusive development of the digital economy, including through structural reforms.

Structural reforms can be conceived narrowly or broadly, and either in the context of holistic policy frameworks designed to tackle complex challenges or on a standalone basis. APEC's Economic Committee defines “core” structural reforms in terms of its work lines: Competition Policy and Law, Strengthening Economic and Legal Infrastructure (SELI), Regulatory Reform, Ease of Doing Business (EoDB), Corporate Law, and Public Sector Governance (PSG). Of those, Competition Policy and Regulatory Reform are the most critical for the digital economy (one could also add Ease of Doing Business) - both are mentioned in the previous section.

However, some take a broader view of structural reforms, particularly when facing “wicked” policy challenges. In 2018 the Economic Committee approved the policy document “Three Approaches to Structural Reform and Inclusive Growth.” According to the Three Approaches, core structural reforms can be “tilted” towards problems of exclusion (Approach 2). However, the report found that deep-seated structural discrimination and exclusion can only be addressed by an integrated approach (Approach 3) that combines the appropriate structural reforms with supporting policies.

Imagine a woman artisan in a remote community who wants to sell internationally but who has had no exposure to digital tools and doesn't know any women who do. It would of course be useful to reduce the regulatory burden on her and others. However, in this case it would be more important to ensure that she has access to both physical and digital infrastructure, along with accompanying ‘soft’ infrastructure, such as training and mentoring programs being made available to her so that she could even become aware of such opportunities and gain the skills and confidence to access them. Thus, the pro-inclusion effects of core structural reforms (that make markets work better) must be supplemented and amplified by appropriate supporting policies

Key Issues

1. Recognise the digital divide and promote digital society development

In parallel with the digital economy is the emergence of the digital society and a breakthrough in the possibilities to apply ICTs in general to the provision of greater inclusion and of social welfare services, whether by governments, the private sector or community-based agencies and non-government organisations. In some APEC economies, best practices are being set for the provision of a digital society and social welfare services; but in others, the resources and capacity to deliver a digital society in the supply of health services, education services and the like is extremely limited.

This implies that the digital divide across APEC goes well beyond basic connectivity access issues with the likelihood that the gap between the least and most well-off will widen. Therefore, a major challenge for APEC will be to narrow this gap significantly by helping the emerging economies develop their own capacity. APEC can do this in many ways, but the three to be highlighted here are:

- to develop the right policy framework that encourages investment and innovation in inclusive-related technologies and services, and focus regulations on areas of greatest social need – making the regulations themselves ‘smart’, rather than blunt instruments of bureaucracy or vested interests. An example is the development of electronic-identity (eID) solutions for cross-sectoral recognition of identity, either in aid of, or resulting from solutions delivery to the unconnected or disenfranchised. A second example is the use of blockchain to ensure provenance of product, an application that was aptly demonstrated in PNG in 2018, and illustrates the ability to shift power back to the small producer. In each case, the participation of the private sector and/or non-government organisations has been crucial in establishing the proof necessary to drive new, or smart (‘flexible’), governance;
- to demonstrate how ICTs can be used most effectively in the delivery of social welfare services. There are many ways in which policies can become ‘smart’ and in which they can be demonstrated. However, to generate sustainability and build upon the political will required to initiate such programs requires effective measurement to demonstrate results, effectiveness and impact; and
- to consider the implications of social barriers in inclusive economic growth, and consider how these may be addressed through structural policy changes and appropriate supporting policies (see *Three Approaches*). In this case, supporting greater inclusion with respect to the digital economy would necessitate not only the ability to measure the digital economy itself but also access to more social data (to support “smart” service delivery) as well as data geared to the specific targeted groups and supporting policies that will accompany structural reforms. In this sense, the measurement requirements to support inclusive growth in the digital age are more geared to the specific needs of economies and their policy choices and go well beyond the traditional debates around digital economy measurement.

2. Promote trade-in-data for MSMEs

Innovations in features, services and devices, and the explosive growth of cloud computing and the services it brings, offer huge potential for industries to grow, and are opening up new windows of opportunities. These initiatives offer MSMEs the opportunity to compete locally, domestically, or globally. For example, cloud computing services, facilitated by the free flow of data, enable businesses to perform activities at scale, cost effectively, in a more agile manner, and in an environment specifically geared to ensuring security. Going digital and deploying sensors can bring great efficiencies to logistics and supply chain management, including bookkeeping, records management and tracking of goods.

- DHL and Cisco estimate that IoT technologies such as asset tracking solutions could have an impact of more than USD1.9 trillion in the supply chain and logistics sector, and the OECD calculates that SMEs and emerging economies stand to “benefit disproportionately” as long as “structural policies facilitate innovation and entrepreneurship to foster innovation and technology diffusion,

ensure that competitive conditions prevail and avoid erecting barriers to cross-border digital markets”.²

- They also reduce loss and improve inventory management, and increase the competitiveness of an economy’s logistics industry.
- Increasing compliance costs for business may be the single biggest constraint to MSMEs participating in the digital economy, particularly as bigger enterprises often have the ability to work around the limitations. This means that compliance costs remain starkly under-appreciated in today’s environment, and continue to disproportionately impact SMEs – *once again because of a lack of measurements*.

3. Bring different stakeholders together on specific opportunities

These stakeholders include government, private sector (large enterprises and MSMEs) and civil society.

The range of stakeholders involved in the issue of digital economy is vast, and represents a group that speaks different technical languages and are many times constrained by different silos, and working with varying timeframes. Bringing them together around specific digital economy opportunities is imperative to success if each side is to understand the other. Most important of all in these dialogues is to help to shift the mindset of regulators from one of risk management, to one of enablement.

Session Objectives

Where do digital gaps exist and what is being done to address such divides? How can digital tools aid in rapidly accelerating inclusion – across diverse constituencies of the economy – many who would traditionally be considered ‘uneconomic’? Neither the digital tools themselves nor structural reforms implemented in isolation will have a transformational impact. A holistic approach is required.

This session looks at the way in which measurement and impact tools are being applied to the emerging digital economy, how governments are looking to promote digital platforms for government services dissemination and citizen engagement, and where such impact can be better understood and made more effective.

² OECD (2018) “Achieving Inclusive Growth in the Face of Digital Transformation and the Future of Work”, OECD Report to G-20 Finance Ministers, 19 March 2018, https://www.oecd.org/g20/OECD_Achieving%20inclusive%20growth%20in%20the%20face%20of%20FoW.pdf